

Minutes of a meeting of the  
Adur Planning Committee  
10 February 2020  
at 7.00 pm

Councillor Carol Albury (Chair)

Councillor David Balfe  
Councillor Brian Boggis  
Councillor Stephen Chipp  
Councillor Brian Coomber

Councillor Lee Cowen  
Councillor Joss Loader  
Councillor Paul Mansfield

**Absent**

Councillor Pat Beresford

**ADC/PC/50/19-20 Substitute Members**

Councillor Brian Boggis substituted for Councillor Pat Beresford.

**ADC/PC/51/19-20 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Brian Boggis, Executive Member for Regeneration, declared an interest in items 7, 8 and 9 as all the reports had recommendations for the Members of the Planning Committee to forward any comments to him in that role. The Member added it was useful to attend the meeting in order to listen and note Members' comments on the reports.

**ADC/PC/52/19-20 Confirmation of Minutes**

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 13 January 2020 be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

**ADC/PC/53/19-20 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions**

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

**ADC/PC/54/19-20 Planning Applications**

The planning applications were considered, see attached appendix.

**ADC/PC/55/19-20 Public Question Time**

The Chairman invited members of the public to ask questions or make statements about any matter for which the Council had a responsibility or which affected the District.

Barb O'Kelly raised a question with the Head of Planning and Development.

If there is mitigation for air pollution along a road like the A259, how can you propose mitigation as a solution to the air pollution? She also felt the Travel Plan for the Focus development wasn't working as intended.

The Head of Planning and Development advised that part of the air quality assessment would be to look at the amount of traffic generated before and after development had been implemented, and to compare that data. In respect of individual developments, part of the mitigation could be the number and nature of the vehicles on the site, together with other sustainability measures put in place by the developer, in an effort to reduce the amount of traffic and mitigate the worsening of the situation.

With regard to Travel Plans, the Officer said it was an enforcement matter to ensure Plans are initiated and monitored to ensure a reduction in car usage/traffic.

### **ADC/PC/56/19-20 Clarification of Adur Affordable Housing Threshold**

The Head of Planning & Development outlined the report which sought to clarify the threshold for seeking affordable housing for development in the Adur Local Plan area.

The Officer advised the Local Plan included a threshold of 11 dwellings however, the National Planning Policy Framework provided a national minimum level at which contributions could be sought as 10 dwellings. The Head of Planning and Development stated that it was suggested the Council followed the NPPF threshold rather than the local plan figure as set out in the Adur Interim Affordable Housing Position Statement.

The Committee Members were being asked to pass any comments to the Executive Member for Regeneration regarding the revision of the affordable housing policy threshold.

A Member raised queries on the report with the Officer regarding economic viability constraints and how developers demonstrated they were unable to meet Local Plan requirements. Another Member questioned what the repercussions would be if the Council went against the NPPF guidelines. Both queries were answered in detail to the Members' satisfaction.

The Committee discussed the report, advising they were keen to ensure the Council did all it could to ensure the delivery of affordable housing.

#### **Decision**

As requested, the Committee Members made comments on the report to be forwarded to the Executive Member for Regeneration with regards to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) revised threshold for affordable housing to be amended to 10 dwellings in line with national policy, as set out in the Interim Policy Statement.

### **ADC/PC/57/19-20 Adoption of the West Sussex County Council Parking Guidance**

The Head of Planning and Development introduced the report which advised Members of the Parking Guidance that had been adopted by WSCC in August 2019. A copy of the Guidance had been appended to the report.

Members were advised that Officers had raised concerns as to how the guidance had been applied and stressed to WSCC that in their parking responses on planning applications they would prefer WSCC to refer back to their own standards to ascertain whether there was a shortfall or surplus, and to comment on the potential impact. Generally, the response received had been there were 'no highway objections' and left to the local authority to determine on amenity grounds whether there was any impact on the area.

The Officer referred Members to page 32 of the report regarding Electric Vehicle Charging points, which stated charging points for electric vehicles should be provided at a minimum of 20% of all parking spaces however, it was felt the Parking Guidance may be superseded by government guidance. The Government had been consulting on changes to the building regulations that would make it mandatory for all new dwellings to have EV Charging points.

No response to the consultation had been made by the Government.

Officers had also found it disappointing that the Guidance had stipulated 3 car parking spaces for 4 bedroom houses on greenfield sites. He advised that given the Council's stance on climate change it was felt we should be encouraging less car ownership and usage.

Officers had challenged WSCC on their consultation responses but they had responded that Adur & Worthing Councils could produce their own parking standards however County would then be unable to provide support at appeal.

In conclusion, whilst there were concerns about the new standards the Officer stated it did provide an up-to-date evidence background against which to assess planning applications and therefore recommended the WSCC Parking Guidance be adopted by Members.

Members discussed the report and topics raised included the use of single passenger cars; insufficient car parking spaces at new developments; controlled parking zones being introduced in Adur; the need for incentives to travel by other means and reduced parking standards in sustainable locations.

The Officer felt there needed to be a robust approach to Travel Plans where there were high density developments and ensure incentives such as Car Clubs were implemented. However, he stressed he felt it was necessary to avoid more car usage and invest more in cycling and public transport.

#### Decision

The Committee raised comments on the Car Parking Standards which were noted by the Executive Member for Regeneration. Members noted that in sustainable locations the Car Parking Standards should be reduced provided that appropriate alternatives to the car were available. The Committee agreed that there was a need to improve public transport particularly buses (frequency and cost).

## **ADC/PC/58/19-20 Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Sussex 2019**

The Head of Planning and Development advised the adopted Local Plan referred to the 2013 version of the Air Quality Partnership that Adur and Worthing had signed up to in order to ensure that all new developments mitigated the impact on local air quality. The report referred to the updated guidance and the Officer introduced Nadeem Shad, Team Leader (Environmental Protection), to answer any technical questions on air quality Members may wish to raise.

A Member requested an explanation regarding cumulative impact assessments. The Environmental Protection Officer responded that each major development had to include a cumulative impact assessment. They had to take account of the previous developments that had been granted permission and the impact of those developments, transport in particular, and feed those into their air quality modelling for their development. He pointed out it was only committed developments though, not those yet to go through the planning system.

The Head of Planning and Development added that Officers needed to ensure developers provided financial contributions if on-site and off-site mitigation had not been provided. The Officer said it was a challenge addressing our housing need, but doing so in a sustainable way, however, one of the ways would be not providing car parking but finding alternatives.

Further discussion took place, which included the inevitable increase in traffic along the A259, inadequate infrastructure and the adoption of low car parking standards for developments in an effort to encourage alternatives. The Officer referred to car free or very low parking provision at developments and car clubs and felt that was the only way forward to avoid an adverse impact on air quality.

The Head of Planning and Development stated the detailed guidance provided a methodology developers had to follow in order for Officers to assess air quality assessments from the applicant's consultants.

In conclusion, in response to queries raised by a Member, the Environmental Protection Officer agreed to look into amending Section 1, Step 2 (3) which should read - The mitigation assessment should be carried out by a developer, their agent or consultant, and a sentence in Section 2 - Where mitigation is not integrated into a proposed development, the LPA may require this through relevant planning conditions or Section 106 agreement. A Member requested this be amended to 'will' instead of 'may'. The Officer agreed to take the amendment back to the Sussex-air partnership in an effort to strengthen the guidance.

### **Decision**

The Committee raised comments on the Sussex Air Quality Planning Guidance which the Executive Member for Regeneration noted. Members felt the wording could be strengthened in some places to ensure that developers provided financial contributions if on-site and off-site mitigation were not provided.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.28 pm, having commenced at 7.00 pm.

### **Chairman**